HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

SOLID WASTE RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SPECIAL MEETING
MINUTES

December 10, 2008

PRESENT:	Councillor Bill Karsten, Chair Deputy Mayor David Hendsbee Councillor Reg Rankin Councillor Tim Outhit
REGRETS:	Councillor Debbie Hum
STAFF:	Mr. Jim Bauld, Manager, Solid Waste Resources Mr. Mike Labrecque, Director, Transportation and Public Works Ms. Chris Newson, Legislative Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. CALL TO ORDER 3

1.1 Waive Rules of Order re: Notice of Meeting 3

2. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS, DELETIONS 3

3. REPORTS 3

3.1 CORRUGATED CARDBOARD 3
3.2 2009 MEETING SCHEDULE ..... 3 & 14

4. ADDED ITEMS 14

5. NEXT MEETING DATE 14

6. ADJOURNMENT 15

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Karsten, Chair, called the meeting to order at 11:35 pm in Council Chamber, 3rd Floor, City Hall, Halifax.

1.1 Waive Rules of Order

MOVED BY Deputy Mayor Hendsbee, seconded by Councillor Outhit that the Solid Waste Advisory Committee waive the Rules of Order as outlined in Section 8 of Administrative Order 1, Sub-section (4) and (6) in regard to written notice of any special meeting, and; requiring that the information be delivered to the members not less than seventy-two hours prior to the time fixed for the meeting. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

2. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Move: Item 3.2 2009 Meeting Schedule to be dealt with immediately following the approval of the agenda.

MOVED BY Councillor Outhit, seconded by Councillor Rankin, that the Order of Business, as amended, be approved. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

3. REPORTS

The Committee agreed, during the approval of the agenda, to deal with Item 3.2 at this time.

3.2 2009 Meeting Schedule

- A copy of the proposed 2009 Meeting Schedule was before the Committee.

MOVED BY Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Outhit that approval of the 2009 Meeting Schedule be deferred to the next meeting pending confirmation of dates in regard to holidays. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

3.1 ICI Corrugated Cardboard

- An e-mail dated December 8, 2008 from Mr. Jim Bauld to members of the industry in regard to Old Corrugated Cardboard (OCC) was before the Committee.
- A copy of a letter dated December 3, 2008 to Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Wayne Anstey, in regard to Old Corrugated Cardboard (OCC) was before the Committee.

Councillor Karsten, Chair, explained that there would be flexibility with the Rules of Procedures for this meeting and that those members of the public in attendance who wished to comment on the issue would be provided an opportunity to address the Committee.

MOVED BY Councillor Rankin, seconded by Deputy Mayor Hendsbee that the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee adopt the following procedure for this special meeting:

1. **Request a brief background on the issue from staff;**
2. **Provide an opportunity for those members of the public in attendance to address the Committee with their comments/concerns;**
3. **Permit those Councillors in attendance, who are not voting members of the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee, an opportunity to comment during the public participation portion of the meeting;**
4. **Request that staff respond to any comments/concerns presented during the proceedings.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

Mr. Jim Bauld, Manager, Solid Waste Resources, Transportation and Public Works, provided a brief background on the situation. He circulated five (5) handouts during his presentation.

Handout 1: Waste/Resource System Mass Balance (Twelve Months to October)

The mass balance analysis and approach was approved by Council in 1996 following a joint effort with HRM staff, Sound Resource Consultants, and the future operators of the Otter Lake Mixed Waste Facility (MIRROR Nova Scotia). The approach, identified by the Community Stakeholders Committee (1995), reflected the various waste management streams (recyclables, organics, household hazardous and waste).

At that time there was existing infrastructure in both the municipal and private sector that could accept the various materials. HRM's recycling facility was processing approximately 14,000 - 15,000 tonnes per year; currently the facility is processing 22,000 tonnes per year. Residential material is approximately 80% of that amount. No composting facility existed at that time, therefore, a Mass Balance System was devised to determine the scope, scale, cost and capacity required for the future composting, and waste facility at Otter Lake. The requirements were included in HRM's submission to the Department of Environment and Labour as HRM's Waste Management Plan Strategy for the next twenty (20) years which would achieve 50% diversion by the year 2000.

The submission outlined how HRM would handle the banned materials (recyclables) and indicated there would be an accommodation of the existing public facilities and investment made either directly (Household Hazardous Waste Depot) or through long term operating contracts or; as approved by the Solid Waste Resource regulations of the province, outside non-municipal public sector assets such as private construction and demolition waste facility and private existing fibre recycling facilities.

Mr. Bauld noted that the green highlighted section on the handout reflected the Residential Recycling program for the last twelve months. 18,000 tonnes of residential material was received and recycled; 3600 tonnes of commercial material was received for a total of just under 22,000 tonnes. He further noted that the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee, later supported by Regional Council, agreed that HRM would not invest in the fibre recycling as there were private recycling facilities that could receive that material. The estimated mass balance received by the two commercial facilities per year is 43,000 tonnes.

Due to the recent down turn in the world commodities market, Scotia Recycling, and others, are now charging a $25 per tonne fee to accept the material (corrugated cardboard/loose, clean office paper/newspaper) where they once paid up to $100 per tonne for that same product. On November 4, 2008, private waste collectors (haulers) were notified of that and advised that they would be required to separate all other fibre from the corrugated cardboard. Currently, there is no tipping fee at the HRM Material Recycling Facility (MRF) which has resulted in a large volume of commercial fibre paper being transferred over to the HRM facility.

Mr. Bauld circulated Handout #2 at this time.

Handout 2: <u>Comparison of ICI Recyclables Delivered to the MRF (Materials Recycling Facility) - Weekly Average of November 2007 vs. First Week of December 2008</u>

Mr. Bauld noted the significant increase of 128% in ICI recyclables delivered to the Material Recycling Facility in an average week when comparing November 2007 with December 2008. He explained that the "X's" represented the four largest waste management collection companies (private) in HRM and the "✓" represented the two companies who were still delivering between 150 to 200 tonnes of material per week; to the private paper recyclers, an additional 8,000 to 10,500 tonnes per year. If this material were to be received at the HRM MRF, the total annual tonnage would be 38,500 to 41,000 tonnes per year. Such a significant increase in recyclables would raise a number of operational / administrative concerns such as:

- Occupational Health and Safety Issues: the tipping floor at the MRF was not designed to handle above 28,000 tonnes per year.
- The recently awarded Request For Proposal (RFP 08-804) to Miller Waste, indicated that an increase in capacity would not be required, however; if an expansion were required, the costs would be $225,000 (capital) and an

additional $80,000 per year for operational costs.
- Storage capacity: the storage of fibre could take up to 1/3, or more, of the tipping floor which would utilize the entire tipping floor capacity and restrict or prohibit the 18,000 tonnes of residential recycling per year.
- Staff would be under dangerous conditions with possible fire issues due to that much fibre on the floor.

Mr. Bauld explained that Scotia Recycling will accept small amounts of wet corrugated cardboard mixed with dry cardboard which is taken to their plant in Hantsport and eventually formed into new box board. The markets for corrugated cardboard and other markets are different through Miller Waste whose end markets specifications state no damp/wet corrugated cardboard accepted.

Currently, market conditions are very tenuous for this material due to the down turn in the world commodities market resulting in recyclable materials being stored all across Canada. Mr. Bauld noted that wet cardboard was no longer the issue; the issue now was that HRM's MRF simply does not have the capacity to take receipt of 43,000 tonnes per year of ICI fibre.

Mr. Bauld distributed Handout #3 at this time.

Handout 3: Letter to Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Wayne Anstey

Mr. Bauld circulated a table of information in response to issues raised in the industry's letter to HRM's Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Wayne Anstey, dated December 4, 2008. He referred specifically to comments in regard to wet/damp cardboard; acceptance of commercial fibre at HRM's Material Recycling Facility (MRF); By-Law requirements in regard to recyclables going to the MRF; sorting of recyclables (By-Law S-600, Sections 12.2 (a) and (b) and Section 13.1 (a)), and; the issue of inconsistent messaging in regard to damp cardboard.

Mr. Bauld also noted that staff have made over 580 inspections of commercial properties in the last fiscal year and have met with commercial property owners / managers to provide information / education sessions in regard to By-Law S-600. Summary Offence Tickets (SOT's) have been issued in regard to non-compliance of By-Law S-600.

In summary, Mr. Bauld advised that the HRM Material Recycling Facility (MRF) was never intended to accept significant volumes of ICI fibre. The private sector historically accepted the material and continues to accept ICI fibre, however; the recent change in the world commodity markets has resulted in a price change at local private recycling facilities for that material. HRM's mandate continues to be providing service to the 135,000 residential properties which generate 18,000 tonnes of recyclables per year.

Mr. Bauld circulated Handout #4 at this time.

Handout 4: Solid Waste-Resource Management Regulations

Mr. Bauld circulated copies of the Solid Waste Resource Management Regulations noting that the document shows that it was up to each municipality to determine how the material would be managed and that it could go to a municipal facility or other (private).

Councillor Hum entered the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

Mr. Bauld circulated handout #5 at this time.

Handout 5: Potential New Markets

Mr. Bauld referred the Committee to page 7, which outlined the current status of recycling in Nova Scotia, and page 8 which listed options for the Committee's consideration. He explained that the options would be reviewed that afternoon as part of a conference call between the Regional Chairs Sub-Committee including Ms. Laurie Lewis, HRM's Diversion Planning Coordinator.

In regard to the options listed, Mr. Bauld noted that:

- expansion of facility: there are only three months left in the current contract with the operators of the HRM Material Recycling Facility (MRF). A six month notification would be required for any expansion of the facility.
- introduce interim storage of ICI fibre (three to four months): the storage option would incur an additional cost for HRM and would be subject to warehousing availability and fire regulations. He suggested a provincial review of the current situation to address the issue for provincially rather than just the HRM.
- HRM could consider acceptance of a limited amount of mixed fibre with a weekly capacity. Consideration would be based on the daily tonnage and the weekly average for the previous month. This was not a viable option as there would be no certainty to the figures. He further cautioned that to perpetuate uncertainty was not a smart management plan.

In summary, Mr. Bauld advised that blue bag recyclables from the commercial sector would still be accepted, however; no ICI corrugated cardboard would be accepted due to the tenuous market situation and issues with storage facility capacity.

Councillor Karsten, Chair, opened the meeting to members of the industry in attendance who wished to speak. He outlined the rules for public presentations then called upon the first speaker to come forward.

Mr. Alan Abraham, Jr. Green Waste Systems

Mr. Abraham noted that he was one of the signatories on the December 3, 2008 letter

addressed to Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Wayne Anstey. The three signatories on the letter represent in excess of $500,000 per month in disposal fees; a major portion of what goes into the city's infrastructure in regard to the solid waste program and also represents one of the largest tax bases. Mr. Abraham explained that he was not clear on what constituted "wet cardboard" and could not find a definition for that term. He requested clarity on whether cardboard was acceptable or not at the recycling facilities.

Mr. Jim Bauld responded that wet cardboard was not permitted.

Mr. Abraham explained that there were capacity concerns with the private facilities as there were only two within HRM accepting (ICI) cardboard, Scotia Recycling and Great Northern (who just started accepting cardboard December 10th). He explained that the OCC co-mingled with paper was no longer acceptable anywhere. Scotia and Great Northern will no longer accept the mixed material. Mr. Abraham stressed the point that the collectors (haulers) need a place to take the product they collect from the institutions, commercial and industrial customers (schools, universities etc.). He noted that HRM introduced the diversion/removal of these products from the landfill and that it was not that easy for the clients, on a short term basis, to place additional bins to sort this material. He commented that the decisions made were based on the seasonality of OCC which reaches its peak in November and December due to the Christmas season. He suggested that other options be explored such as: expanding hours at the Otter Lake facility and/or adding extra shifts at the Material Recycling Facility (MRF).

Mr. Joe Warwick, EnviroWaste

Mr. Warwick noted that it was good to be working toward a solution for the current crisis in the recycling markets which has seen a once marketable product lose its value to the point that a cost was now associated to dispose of the material. His main concern was in continuing to provide a service while remaining consistent with HRM's By-Law (S-600). Since November 1, 2008, members of the industry have been communicating with HRM Solid Waste staff in order for find a solution for the current crisis. One consistent issue has been the two different standards for collection of recyclables: commercial sector versus the residential sector. He noted that although the priority of HRM was to service the 135,000 residential sector, there are 100,000 commercial customers who also pay taxes.

On November 14, 2008, he met with Mr. Bauld and Ms. Lewis in regard to a transition period to have the blue bags removed from the fibre stream which resulted in the decision that HRM's Material Recycling Facility (MRF) would only accept recyclable material in two streams; blue bag or OCC/ONP (old corrugated cardboard/old newsprint) and mixed paper. He noted that the haulers complied with this method by doing a pre-sort at their facility in Sackville on a short term basis to get customers to sort; prior to that it went to private facilities for sorting.

Mr. Warwick provided the following time line in regard to information received from

HRM:

- On November 5, 2008, he was informed by HRM that even though the private processors would not accept mixed cardboard/paper/newsprint, the HRM MRF would still accept that material. He noted that he communicated this information to his customers.
- On November 18, 2008, clarification was received from Mr. Bauld in regard to the acceptance of OCC/ONP and mixed paper.
- On November 20th an e-mail was received in regard to the banning of wet OCC. Some misunderstanding resulted in regard to what constituted wet OCC. He added that he did not believe that the material was not recyclable but rather there was no market for the product at this time.
- In an effort to work with HRM staff to find solution, his first response was to export the material outside HRM boundaries, however; once the material has been deemed non-recyclable it has to remain within the boundaries. Permission was then received to take the material to Otter lake since it was deemed un-recyclable.
- On December 8th communication was received that the MRF would no longer receive any OCC, again, this is inconsistent with the By-Law and educational information circulated throughout the commercial sector of HRM.

Mr. Warwick commented that a permanent alternative to capacity and quality issues at the HRM owned and operated Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) had to be found. The HRM Waste Collection Program has a contingency plan for compost and the Otter Lake facility. He explained that the collectors were requesting alternatives as they do not appear to have any other than to transport the material to Otter Lake. He suggested perhaps an extra shift at the MRF.

Mr. Jeff Traver, District Manager, Miller Waste

Mr. Traver noted that he was speaking as an operator of the Miller Waste Material Recovery Facility and as a commercial hauler. From a hauling perspective, Miller Waste does not expect the taxpayer to subsidize their business. Since 1999, Miller Waste has been a four stream recycling centre: cardboard , newspaper and fibre have been separated out and taken to Scotia Recycling at a $25 per tonne charge and blue bag material has been separated from organics. In regard to capacity, shifts have been extended (including Saturdays) and an additional eight employees have been hired. The maintenance crew commence at 4:00 p.m. and work until midnight. Miller Waste has used every marketing resource to keep the facility open but does not have the capacity to handle the amount of commercial paper being diverted to that facility nor was it designed to handle that much commercial paper (1% commercial 80% residential).

Mr. Steve Beazley

Mr. Beazley noted that the markets were an issue but that HRM has a program in place and the haulers, only part players in this, were given very short notice (two days) of the major change and need more time. He explained that he had quoted prices to

customers two days ago without knowing this major change was to take place. He stressed that the industry, the Committee, and HRM have to work together to find another option and that the receipt of this material (ICI/OCC) should not be cut off now.

Mr. Sean Jordan, Waste Management
Mr. Jordan explained that from a waste management point of view, he has done what HRM staff and By-Law S-600 has required. He noted that he has spoken with thousands of customers who are not happy with this major change in operations. The customers are advising that they are being asked to do things they have never had to do before; that there is not enough space for them to create additional (sorting/storage) space and that the change in direction occurred too quickly with very short notice. Mr. Jordan advised that they want to do the right thing but cannot have constant change in direction.

Mr. Brian Smith, Eastern Shore Cartage, Sheet Harbour
Mr. Smith advised that his company recycles cardboard from Sobeys and sells it to Scotia Recycling in Hantsport. He separates and stores the cardboard onsite. The cardboard is stored outside and does get wet. He was told by Scotia Recycling that they will not be taking anymore cardboard from his facility until late May or July. If he were to take the material to the local Scotia Recycling in Dartmouth there would be a $50 per tonne charge. He noted that it costs him $100 to have the material baled (three employees who sort and bale the material by hand). Mr. Smith noted that he has five tractor trailer loads (130 tonnes) of this material in his yard that he cannot dispose of. He requested assistance in the form of direction on what to do with this material.

Mr. Steven Taylor, Citizen Who Worked in Industry
Mr. Taylor commented that this issue is not only that of HRM, the issue also involves provincial legislation and the RRFB education funds. He noted that HRM has taken money from the RRFB to educate commercial business and put everything in place and now we are at a crossroads. Mr. Taylor explained that people to stop residents from doing what they do at home (separating at source), the business (education piece) will be a failure. He further noted that he has never heard that wet cardboard was not recyclable in commercial industry as he has taken cardboard/paper to the Material Recycling Facility. He added that the issue becomes confusing when you consider that residential curbside cardboard may get wet if it rains but is still accepted but wet commercial cardboard is not acceptable. He noted that these are tough times and HRM has to step up and bring everyone together. There is a charge now associated with commercial garbage as it has no value. When something has no value, it is the job of those who introduced the legislation (government) to get rid of it; place it in the landfill. The law says the material has to be collected and the industry has no where to turn. He also commented that he would be speaking with the Minister about this issue that evening.

Mr. Andrew Inch, Dexter-Municipal Group
Mr. Inch noted that this issue was not a cost issue or that of haulers trying to find a

cheap alternative. Everyone would be willing to pay the actual cost but a solution is needed. The customers are not recyclable sorters and do not have the facilities to do the sorting. He explained that he did not have a problem paying a tipping fee to deal with this issue as long as he knew where the material was to go and that it was to be sorted at that facility. Mr. Inch commented that it was incumbent upon HRM to deal with all recyclables and find solutions as it was their three stream system (organics, waste, recyclable) that they put in place.

Mr. Inch responded to Councillor Rankin that throughout the By-Law there is reference to a three-stream system. He noted that the recent amendment was only in reference to signage of the containers. The industry has done what it can to accommodate the By-Law and in so doing it may cause customers to add a fourth container. He emphasized the fact that By-Law S-600 does not mandate a separate container nor that blue bag material be separated from fibre. There would be a cost to the customer in order to change their system of sorting and setting out for collection as the paper separation stream is a new stream.

Councillor Karsten called for the third and final time for any further speakers on this matter. There being no further public speakers, he called forward Councillor Uteck at this time.

Councillor Sue Uteck

Councillor Uteck noted that she was not a member of the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee but has received numerous phone calls from her district in regard to the recent changes. She added that she was not impressed that Regional Council had not been notified of those changes which left her at a disadvantage and unable to respond to the concerns when the phone calls were first received. She inquired if there had been a legal opinion from HRM on this issue. Councillor Uteck noted that she could not find reference in the contract to the 80% residential, 20% commercial noting sections N (fibre recycling and B- materials recovery facility). She noted that HRM was to be the leader in this effort, that it was designed and implemented by HRM and it was incumbent upon HRM to resolve this crisis. She agreed with an earlier comment that this issue cannot be placed on the taxpayer. There are many businesses in her area that will be affected by this change and an answer has to be prepared for Tuesday's Regional Council session. Councillor Uteck also questioned where the decision to reject of wet cardboard came from as she has found no reference to that in the documentation nor could she find a definition of what constituted wet cardboard. She suggested that the material was being rejected as no one knows what to do with it. Councillor Uteck commented that she did not see a response from legal in regard to whether it was HRM's outright right to reject this material.

Councillor Karsten called upon staff to respond to the concerns raised.

Mr. Bauld empathized with the industry, businesses an taxpayers of commercial properties. He explained that Section 13.1, Subsection A (8), (9), (10) and (11) on

page 21 and 22 of By-Law S-600 clearly outlines that four containers are required with signage (garbage, recyclables, paper/cardboard and compost). Section 3 (g) of the By-Law defines the Administrator of the By-Law, being himself, and he took full responsibility for the non-communication to Regional Council on the issue of changes in dynamics of the marketability of fibre. He explained that he had intended to update members of Regional Council of this issue through Chief Administrative Officer's Weekly Activity Report on Friday, December 12th.

Councillor Hum expressed concern that there had been no response provided from HRM's Legal Services on this matter. She noted that clarification on the challenges to the By-Law were required. She requested a legal response prior to the Committee making a recommendation.

MOVED BY Councillor Hum, seconded by Councillor Rankin that the Solid Waste Advisory Committee request an opinion from HRM's Legal Services in regard to the change in operational policy of HRM's Materials Recycling Facility that bans receipt of old corrugated cardboard (OCC) from the ICI sector at the Materials Recovery Facility, 20 Horseshoe Lake Drive, and; that mixed fibre be separated from the blue bags and not contain any old corrugated cardboard and provide a definition of what constitutes "wet cardboard".

Mr. Bauld noted that RFP (Request for Proposal) 08-084 clearly identified in the tonnage document that the recycling facility in 07/08, in regard to ICI, was to have a small amount of commercial but more from the residential component. He added that he has not reviewed the contract for the detail at this point but that the requirement was clearly identified in the RFP. He further noted that HRM By-Law Officers were communicating the message to all commercial customers and advising them what materials would be received at all HRM sponsored facilities.

Mr. Bauld further emphasized that the issue was the lack of capacity to take receipt of substantial volumes of (commercial) material that would potentially more than triple the volume. He reminded the Committee that there would be no cost to the haulers to take the material to Scotia Recycling if the material were baled. He acknowledged that the By-Law does not allow for the export of recycling material to keep it out of landfill. He noted that some private collection companies have given fuel rebates to help offset the cost of the tipping fee charged at Scotia Recycling. In regard to curbside collection of damp corrugated cardboard, he advised that there had only been one case of the material being rejected and that was due to a hurricane as most residents wait for the next collection cycle rather than place the cardboard in the rain. Mr. Bauld explained that a small quantity of damp material was received from the residential sector given that a residential vehicle may service 800 homes per day, however; a commercial hauler creates much higher volumes on the tipping floor and is difficult to manage.

Councillor Karsten thanked the speakers and staff for their comments.

Deputy Mayor Hendsbee expressed concern with the short notice given to the industry and inquired how the industry was to react to the situation considering that the issue had probably been progressing with the downturn in the economy. He noted that HRM had to share some of the responsibility and assist the industry in finding a solution. Deputy Mayor Hendsbee advised that he had spoken with the former minister Wayne Adams about this issue last week and commented that with the overabundance of corrugated cardboard and the shortage of wood pellets, it was too bad there was not a way to convert the cardboard to wood pellets or fire logs. He further noted that the upcoming Christmas season was the peak period for this material and there would be an innundation of cardboard in warehouses. He would have preferred to have seen a deadline in the New Year to allow (the industry and customers) some latitude to accommodate for the change. In regard to the capacity issue, he acknowledged that he was unsure of what to do as the sorting does not resolve the volume of material. Deputy Mayor Hendsbee noted that if a tipping fee to help offset the handling fee then HRM would have to consider that option. Again, the issue becomes, where does the material go. He was not in favour of warehouses stockpiling the material due to fire hazards.

Mr. Bauld noted that the Regional Chairs Sub-Committee would be gathering information later in the day during their scheduled conference call. He stressed that HRM was not walking away from the issue and that the information would be shared with the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee for review. He clarified that the private sector gave notification on November 5, 2008 that they will continue to accept corrugated cardboard, office paper and fibre as long as it was separated. The resulting charge by the private sector for the mixed material is what has sent the product to the HRM facilities. He explained that HRM will look at the costs and if it can physically accept the material without added danger, it will be considered.

Councilor Rankin stressed that HRM has to move beyond an expression of sympathy and take care of the issue. Integration means everything fits together and it is HRM's obligation to resolve the issues such as the cost to the customer to separate the material (extra containers), a working definition of wet cardboard - can wet cardboard go to the landfill. He noted that the commercial taxes pay more than their fair share for the infrastructure of the waste system including the Material Recycling Facility. The problem is that the material no longer has value and therefore it is not profitable for the private sector who were assisting us with this issue but it is not their problem. Councillor Rankin also noted that HRM receives approximately $ 3 million per year in Dividends with 55% of that coming from the commercial sector but those funds do not go back to them.

Councillor Outhit commented that all the parties were in attendance today and he was encouraged by the options put forward. He noted that he would like to have feedback from the Regional Chairs meeting scheduled for that afternoon and that the Committee had to make a decision.

MOVED BY Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Hum that the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee encourage staff, members of the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee and industry stakeholders to continue working toward finding resolutions to the operational issues raised in the letter dated December 3, 2008 addressed to Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Wayne Anstey. MOTION PUT AND PASSED

Councillor Uteck noted that there were solutions for the short term such as:

- Interim storage, 3 to 4 months,
- Postponement of By-law (concern that illegal dumping would occur if there were no place to take the material),
- Send material to MIRROR and charge a tipping fee. Something has to be done prior to the heavy Christmas season.

MOVED BY Councillor Hum, seconded by Councillor Rankin that the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee request a staff report for the Tuesday, December 16, 2008 Regional Council session outlining the following:

1. **that HRM provide interim storage (of OCC products) for the next three to four months and that the cost associated with this initiative be provided;**
2. **that HRM accept OCC material at the Otter Lake Facility and that a tipping fee be charged. Staff are to outline the cost associated with this option.**
3. **that HRM consider adding a baling service for OCC materials and that a fee be charged for that service.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

By request of the Solid Waste Resource Advisory Committee, and due to the concerns noted by Committee members as well as industry stakeholders, Mr. Jim Bauld, Manager, Solid Waste Resources, Transportation and Public works, agreed to extend the ban of receipt of loads of old corrugated cardboard (OCC) at the Materials Recovery Facility, 20 Horseshoe Drive, until Friday, December 12, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

3.2 2009 Meeting Schedule

Dealt with earlier in meeting.

4. ADDED ITEMS - NONE

5. NEXT MEETING DATE - TBA
6. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:40p.m.

Chris Newson
Legislative Assistant